

State	Has your state organized a team that will be responsible for implementing the computer changes that your state will need, to be able to use CDLIS to exchange medical examiner's certificate information electronically with the National Registry?
Alaska (Mina Peters)	Not yet
Arizona	No, we do not have a team yet as this has not yet become prioritized work.
Arkansas (Tonie Shields)	Yes
Connecticut (Susan Archambault)	Yes
Idaho (Reggie Phipps)	YES
Indiana (Melissa Lechner)	Final team has not be assigned at this time.
Kentucky (Chris Lindsey)	No Response from SDLA

Louisina (Paige Paxton)	only team I ever have on CDL is me and Bruce Ragas
Maine (Linda Grant)	yes
Maryland (Alice Ike)	The Maryland Department of Transportation, Motor Vehicle Administration, has identified staff who will work on this project.
Nevada	Our team is our Driver License track programmers within out MVIT section.

New Jersey (Michael Cox)	Yes
New York (Erin Murphey)	Yes
North Carolina (Robert Quinn)	No, no team has been organized.
Ohio (Marcia Fisher)	YES
Oregon (Russ Casler)	Not exactly. Oregon has a group that is closely monitoring the progress of NRII, but due to the state's looming System Transformation Program (STP) and an unclear implementation date for NRII, resources are being utilized elsewhere.

Rhode Island (Nicole Barnett)	No. RI is in the middle of a HUGE system modernization due to launch in July, 2017. We have a slew of changes and enhancements already in the pipeline for post go-live.
South Carolina (Frank Rodgers)	No Response from SDLA
South Dakota (Jane Schrank)	Yes
Texas (Cynthia Allison)	No
Vermont (Robert Melchner)	Yes
Washington (Tandy Alexander)	Yes, we are replacing our legacy system and this will be part of the implementation. Not sure of the implementation date based on January specs at this time.
Wyoming (Misty Zimmerman)	Yes

Has your state developed a project plan to implement CDLIS changes for the National Registry II Final Rule?

It will depend on when we implement. I had a plan developed for our mainframe application – however, since we are getting a later start than expected, we will probably need to implement on the new system, so will need a new plan.

No; however, it is anticipated to follow a similar project plan to the EVVER project.

No

No

YES

Final team has not be assigned at this time.

No Response from SDLA

No.. In theory we believe we know how it should work.

It is on the project list but no definitive plan developed

Having received the mini specifications, we look forward to developing our project plan in the very near future

The Department cannot create a formal project plan until FMCSA provides the full specifications document to the jurisdictions.

No
We have begun developing a plan, but will need full specs to complete it.
We currently have no project plan for implementation.
NO
<p>No. Our goal is to include NRII as a part of our STP, a major system modernization effort, rather than develop and test programming for our current system that will just be thrown out when the new system is implemented. Without having the contractor on board and a new, vendor-led driver system team in place, there is no way to develop a project plan.</p>

No.
No Response from SDLA
Not yet
No
No
Not completely. We are working with our software replacement team.
Yes, we are starting on one.

How many months does your SDLA need to implement CDLIS changes for the National Registry II Final Rule, from beginning to being operational in production?

In our current system, 6 months. In the new system, unknown.

The state needs at minimum seven months to implement once we have the final specification documents.

6 months

Approximately 24 months

12 months

With our limited build schedule our state would need at least 9 – 12 months

No Response from SDLA

We need well past that 2018 date. We have very limited resources as you can see above. I, also, am over the driver's license program in general, regular medical, dwi, insurance, official driving records, CDL helpdesk and reinstatement. Bruce is my main programmer for all of these. It takes awhile due to other projects as well.

Unable to determine at this time

It has been our experience that about 2 years is needed to implement CDLIS changes, from receipt of final specifications to being operational in production.

For the National Registry II Final Rule, once both sets of mini specifications have been released, we anticipate beginning development. Anticipating release of the final specifications, two cycles of development, and a certification process including certification testing and final testing, we hope to meet the operational deadline of June 2018, assuming that resources and priorities within the agency remain constant at the current levels. We are confident that our projections will be more accurate once both the next set of mini specs and the final specifications have been published and reviewed

This is dependent upon the complete specifications that are provided. We aren't able to provide a complete projection without knowing the specifications.

1.5 Years at minimum
It's difficult to say without full specs. 18 months minimum would be a rough estimate.
From 24 to 36 months
9 MONTHS
Unknown. Without having complete specification documents, coupled with STP, we are unable to determine the exact timeframe we're looking at. However, assuming our proposed implementation schedules with Fast Enterprises are accurate, we should complete our new driver system by mid- to late-2020, and satisfying the NRII requirements would be part of that work.

Unknown
No Response from SDLA
I would say 5 – 7 months would be a safe estimate. Depends heavily on when development will begin and work load.
18 – 24 months
Estimate 8 to 12 months after Final Specs are released
We are targeting to have with our implementation in the new DRIVES system.
12 months

For a comparable CDLIS project in the past with similar complexity, how many months did your SDLA need to implement technical changes, from initial planning stages to being operational in production?

The closest project of this nature (new application, only a few messages which update our system) was SSOLV back in 2007. That took a year, but we were also implementing UNI for the first time in conjunction.

We believe this will be comparable to the EVVER project which completed in just over six months.

S2S – 5 months

18 months

6 months

12-15 months

No Response from SDLA

2 years

No Response from SDLA

Between 18 – 24 months.

It's hard to answer this exactly without knowing the full specifications.

1.5 years

This is a unique project. Typically significant changes to the transmission or acceptance of CDL information/data can take anywhere from 1 – 3 years depending on the size and complexity.

Approximately 30 months

9 MONTHS

It's hard to draw comparisons for this project, not only because of NRIL's structure but because of Oregon's STP. Comparing a project that was done in our current system to a project that we plan to do in the new system may not provide an accurate assessment. Historically though, for a project of this size in our current system, Oregon would estimate about 24 to 30 months.

This will be the first CDLIS project for RI in our new system. Unknown
No Response from SDLA
8 months
18 months
CDLIS MOD
12 months
Varied, pending on existing projects, etc.. Also current legacy system was difficult to implement changes. 1-2 years would have been average.
12-18 months

Are you aware that mini-specifications are available now, to assist your SDLA in gaining a better understanding of the technical requirements for the CDLIS changes that your state will need to implement?

Yes

Yes, however the only one available is what we believe is the simplest of the three to implement. So, while this helps, it's not enough to definitively determine accurate estimates.

Yes

Yes

YES

Yes

No Response from SDLA

Yes

yes

Yes.

The first time the Department was made aware of the mini-specs was at the 2017 CDL Coordinator's meeting. Regardless, the Department will not be able to move forward until the final and full specifications document is provided to the jurisdictions.

No
Yes
Yes
YES
Yes, we are aware the NR01 mini-specs are available and the other two, NR02 and NR03, are currently being worked on. We also understand these mini-specs are subject to change at any given time, as they are not final.

Yes
No Response from SDLA
Yes
Yes
Yes, some are available
Yes
Yes. Wyoming has begun reviewing them and is working with AAMVA as a test State

Are you planning to use the mini-specifications for planning purposes now, or do you plan to wait until the full, complete specifications are ready before you begin planning?

We will use the mini-specs to plan.

We will use them for preliminary planning purposes.

Wait for full spec

No

We need the NIEM specs.

We will wait for the full, complete specifications

No Response from SDLA

No. we can't afford to program something then have to rework it. We do not have the funding nor the manpower. We are waiting for the full.

To use the full specification

Yes, we will use the mini-specifications to help flesh out the project.

The Department is not planning to allocate resources to analyze the mini-specs. It would be a waste of Department resources.

Yes
We've begun developing some of the business requirements, but we will not be developing technical requirements based on the mini-specs. We await full specs.
We will wait until the full complete specifications are ready to begin planning.
WAIT UNTIL FULL, COMPLETE SPECIFICATIONS ARE READY.
We are open to using any tools available to better prepare our planning and implementation, but due to the timing of our STP work, we anticipate having the full, master specifications before starting NRII.

Because of our system conversion, we will more than likely end up planning from the complete specification once available.
No Response from SDLA
Depends on work load but would like to start looking at the mini-specs to get a better understanding of what is needed to be done transaction wise.
They will be used to provide project timeline estimates.
No
We will introduce the mini-specifications to our vendor.
Yes

Are you planning to use the mini-specifications to begin implementation efforts now, or do you plan to wait until the full, complete specifications are ready before you begin implementation?

We can't develop until the full specifications are in place because our current system is going to become obsolete about a month after the full specifications are sent out

Due to the chance of the specifications changing, we plan to wait until the full and complete specifications are completed before we begin implementation efforts other than preliminary planning.

Wait for full spec

We plan on waiting until the full specifications are completed.

We will wait until the complete specifications are ready before we begin implementation.

We will wait for the full, complete specifications

No Response from SDLA

Wait for the full

To use the full specification

We will use the mini-specifications to the extent possible, as we apply a development approach. Full, complete specifications will be required to finalize development and prepare for implementation.

To ensure a complete and timely implementation, we would wait for the full specifications before we begin implementation.

NJ is working on the Real Id Initiative at this time. The plan would be to start reviewing after implementation. 1/2018
We will wait for full specs.
We will wait until the full complete specifications are ready.
WAIT UNTIL FULL, COMPLETE SPECIFICATIONS ARE READY.
Currently, Oregon does not have the available programming resources to begin implementation. STP and other existing, well-defined projects have taken priority over NRII. In the future, Oregon would prefer complete specifications before beginning implementation to avoid any unnecessary program changes based on possible amendments to mini-specs.

Because of our system conversion, we will more than likely end up planning from the complete specification once available.
No Response from SDLA
Currently we are going to wait until the full specs are defined to begin development of the system.
Texas will wait until the full documentation is released before project efforts begin.
No, we will wait for Final Specs
We will use to give our vendor as much information as we can.
Yes

Is there any additional information that you need to ensure that your state is able to implement the CDLIS/National Registry changes into production? If so, please list.

The full specifications, the new Windows platform UNI version, and the new requirement date from FMCSA.

No, we just need the full specifications.

No

No

None at this time.

The full, complete specifications

No Response from SDLA

I have concerns about the driver's having to request the medical examiner's certificate from the examiner after the implementation. We will only receive the data back from non-excepted interstate correct? Best case scenario we receive both non-excepted types. Louisiana requires ALL CDL driver's to obtain a medical examiner's certificate no matter what type of commerce you certify as. The reason for this is I have a huge concern as to why we want to make sure the guy who is transporting toilet paper to Montana is medically qualified, but the guy transporting our children to and from school twice a day is of no concern health wise. All of our driver's are going to have to continue to carry the med examiner's certificate.

No Response from SDLA

The sooner we receive full, complete specifications the better.

No

No

No Response from SDLA

Need the full complete specifications prior to beginning the planning of the project.

COMPLETE SPECIFICATIONS.

As was brought forth by other states at the recent CDL Coordinators Conference in St. Louis, Oregon would like further clarification regarding the two radio buttons on the MEC. If another state sends Oregon a MEC with the second radio button is marked, what is Oregon supposed/required to do?

No
No Response from SDLA
Not currently
No Response from SDLA
Yes, we need the final Specs
We need complete information as soon as possible. Not sure of the implementation date based on January specs at this time.
None that we are aware of as of now.

Any other comments/feedback for FMCSA?

The timing is going to be tricky. We are migrating completely off the mainframe, which includes a brand new application of UNI, going live probably in December, 2017. It has been decided that we will not be able to begin developing NR11 until that application is proven to be stable, which will require at least 6 months of use using the current applications. Based on our current plan, the best case scenario for go-live on this for Alaska would be early 2019. However, any number of unknown factors could delay this further.

No Response from SDLA

No Response from SDLA

No Response from SDLA

The National Registry II will actually simplify our processes, and we can avoid some of the manual work we do now. We will include this in the GEM development (our new system).

No Response from SDLA

Kentucky has volunteered to be a pilot state on this project. I spoke with Mindy Stephens at the coordinators meeting in St. Louis. So Kentucky will be working from the mini specs as soon as they are released to us (already completed NR01). So the answers to the questions below are probably not fair to the other states if our answers are figured in for a compliance date.

No Response from SDLA

The sooner the full specs are ready the better

Release of mini specifications is helpful, from a planning perspective, however, we cannot fully “see” the project until after the master specifications are published. For that reason, responses to this survey are less definite than we would have preferred.

In the past, FMCSA has provided ample lead time for our state to implement necessary changes. We look forward to receiving the full, complete specifications so that we can, once again, implement those changes in accordance with deadlines for achievement established by FMCSA.

The jurisdictions are constantly dealing with State, Federal and other mandates, so the planning and allocation of resources to complete a program enhancement or new project must be carried out in an efficient manner. A mini-spec approach followed by receiving the full specifications later, with the high likelihood of additional modifications, is a deficient way to implement a project. We would recommend that this approach not be taken now or in the future.

No

We've been hearing some concerns from industry and enforcement agencies regarding the impact of NRII on Non-CDL commercial drivers. They ask whether these drivers will still be given paper copies of their med certs. They've also expressed a desire to see med cert information on their driving record. We could use additional information covering this issue for implementation.

No Response from SDLA

WHAT ARE THE REQUIREMENTS FOR STORING THE INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM THE NATIONAL REGISTRY?

IT WILL BE DIFFICULT TO DETERMINE SPECIFIC DATABASE CHANGES WITHOUT HAVING COMPLETE AND FULL SPECIFICATIONS.

We appreciate having the opportunity, through this survey, to provide some insight on our state's current challenges regarding NRII implementation. Oregon is concerned that there may not be a sufficient compliance window to work with, preventing proper program development and testing to be done before implementation. It would be unfair to burden states with an abbreviated timeframe, considering one aspect of the project is to gain efficiencies, not only for government agencies, but for the public. Whatever revised compliance date is chosen should limit the possible negative impact to drivers and accommodate as many jurisdictional limitations as possible. Oregon, and most likely other states, would need a 24- to 30-month timeframe from the point of master specification publication to develop and test programming, thereby ensuring a smooth rollout of NRII.

FMCSA, AAMVA and SDLAs also need to consider the transition between paper and electronic MECs. How will this work? What if a driver has their exam in a state that has implemented NRII, but is licensed in a state that cannot yet accept MEC info electronically? What kind of outreach will be provided to drivers and medical examiners to ensure as little confusion as possible?

As was stated previously, Oregon – like several other states at present – is undergoing a major system modernization. We are in the nascent stages of what will be two 18-month projects to replace our core driver and vehicle systems. This plays a critical role in our state's decisions regarding NRII implementation. Oregon made the difficult choice to stay focused on this larger goal rather than dedicate resources to our current system that will be discarded, knowing full well that means we may not be NRII compliant until second half of 2020. We hope that FMCSA will consider the difficulties and constraints we as states face when trying to accomplish many goals with limited resources and state legislative mandates.

No Response from SDLA

As of right now SCDMV is heavily involved in migrating to a Real-ID credential. This will be our It department's focus for the remainder of the year. At best we can begin reviewing the NRII first quarter of next year. Sorry I can't be more responsive but our workload does not allow us much flexibility this year.

No Response from SDLA

No Response from SDLA

No

Not sure of the implementation date based on January specs at this time.

Wyoming is looking forward to this project and feel it will be both beneficial to the state and to our drivers.

|